The nature of power corrections in large β_0 approximation

Taekoon Lee*

Department of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea

Abstract

We investigate the nature of power corrections and infrared renormalon singularities in large β_0 approximation. We argue that the power correction associated with a renormalon pole singularity should appear at $O(1)$, in contrast to the renormalon ambiguity appearing at $O(1/\beta_0)$, and give an explanation why the leading order renormalon singularities are generically *poles*.

arXiv:hep-ph/0303240v3 21 Jun 2004

*Electronic address: tlee@phya.snu.ac.kr

The perturbative expansion in weak coupling constant is in general an asymptotic expansion, with the perturbative coefficients growing factorially at large orders. When the large order behavior is sign alternating the series may be Borel resummed. On the other hand, a large order behavior of same sign generally implies presence of nonperturbative effects, and in such a case Borel resummation of the series becomes ambiguous.

According to the heuristic but general argument of Borel resummation of a series with a same sign large order behavior [1], the series is first Borel resummed at an unphysical negative coupling, at which it becomes sign alternating, and then analytically continued back to the positive physical coupling, to yield a resummed amplitude. It turns out that the resummed amplitude obtained in this way has a cut along the positive real axis in the complex coupling plane, and consequently has an ambiguous imaginary part at physical coupling. This unphysical imaginary part is then supposed to be canceled by adding a nonperturbative effect, and the total amplitude is given as the sum of the respective real parts of the Borel resummed amplitude and the nonperturbative effect.

In this brief note we study the nature of the power corrections in large β_0 approximation [2], in which the number of quark flavors N_f (or equivalently $\beta_0(\sim N_f)$, the first coefficient of QCD beta function), is pushed to (negative) infinity while $a_s \equiv N_f\alpha_s$ is held fixed, where α_s denotes the strong coupling. A characteristic feature of the Borel transform of an amplitude in this scheme is that all known renormalon singularities at leading order are poles (in general renormalon singularities are branch cuts), and the Borel transform is subleading in $1/\beta_0$ expansion, vanishing at $\beta_0 \to \infty$. To the author's knowledge there is no general explanation for the former, except within the special context of a particular calculation, but the latter comes from the very definition of the approximation. Since the leading term in a_s expansion comes from a gluon exchange with no fermion bubble inserted, the large β_0 perturbative expansion of a generic amplitude $A(\alpha_s)$ takes the form

$$A(\alpha_s) = \frac{1}{\beta_0}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n a_s^{n+1}\,, \tag{1}$$

where a_n are β_0 independent, which gives the Borel transform

$$\tilde{A}(b) = \frac{1}{\beta_0}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{a_n}{n!}b^n \equiv \frac{1}{\beta_0}f(b)\,. \tag{2}$$

Consequently, the renormalon ambiguity of $A(\alpha_s)$ due to a pole in $f(b)$ is $O(1/\beta_0)$, and vanishes at $\beta_0 \to \infty$. In the following we shall see that these features are simply two sides of the same coin.

We begin by observing an universality present in the nonperturbative effect. Since the Borel resummation of a same sign series is based on a general, model independent argument, the term in the nonperturbative effect that gives rise to the cut singularity along the positive real axis in the coupling plane should be universal for a given large order behavior, or equivalently for a given renormalon singularity in Borel plane, and is independent of the specifics of the underlying theory. Thus, the power correction of a pole singularity in large β_0 approximation must share a common functional form with the nonperturbative effect associated with the same type pole singularity in other models, for instance, such solvable models as the quantum mechanical double well potential or the two-dimensional $O(N)$ nonlinear sigma model. In these solvable models the ambiguous term in the nonperturbative effect associated with a pole in Borel plane,

$$\frac{1}{(1-b/b_0)^{1+m}}, \qquad m \text{ a non-negative integer}\,, \tag{3}$$

assumes the form [3]

$$\frac{b_0^{1+m}}{m!} e^{-b_0/\alpha} \alpha^{-m} \ln(-\alpha)\,, \tag{4}$$

where α denotes the coupling constant in consideration, and we expect the power correction of a renormalon pole in large β_0 approximation would also contain a term of the same functional form as (4). Note that the cut along the positive axis is provided by the log function. The correspondence between Eq. (3) and (4) can be easily confirmed using the relation

$$A_{\rm PT}(\alpha \pm i\epsilon) = \int_{0\pm i\epsilon}^{\infty \pm i\epsilon} e^{-\frac{b}{\alpha}} \tilde{A}(b)\, db\,, \tag{5}$$

where $A_{\rm PT}$ denotes the Borel resummed perturbative contribution, and the cancellation of the respective imaginary parts in $A_{\rm PT}$ and the nonperturbative effect.

To see how a nonperturbative term of this type arises in large β_0 approximation we consider the power correction in full QCD. From the renormalization group equation for the power correction of dimension n operator the power correction, denoted by $A_{\rm NP}$, may be written as

$$A_{\rm NP}(\alpha_s) \propto \alpha_s^{-\nu} e^{-\frac{n}{2\beta_0 \alpha_s}} [1 + O(\alpha_s)]\,, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\nu = n\frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_0^2} + \frac{\gamma_0}{\beta_0} \tag{7}$$

and

$$\beta_0 = \frac{1}{4\pi}(11 - \frac{2}{3}N_f)\,, \qquad \beta_1 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}(102 - \frac{38}{3}N_f)\,. \tag{8}$$

Here β_1 and γ_0 are the second coefficient of the beta function and the one loop anomalous dimension of the dimension n operator, respectively. Since a cut can arise only from the pre-exponential factor the ambiguous term in the power correction, denoted by $A_{\rm NP}^{\rm amb.}$, may be written as

$$A_{\rm NP}^{\rm amb.} = C(-a_s)^{-\nu} e^{-\frac{n}{2a_s}}[1 + \frac{1}{\beta_0}O(a_s)]\,, \tag{9}$$

where C is a real constant that may depend on β_0. We now make an observation that plays a crucial role in the following, namely, that for this power correction to be well-defined at $\beta_0 \to \infty$, C must be bounded in the same limit. Thus C may be written as

$$C = c_0 + O(1/\beta_0)\,, \tag{10}$$

where c_0 is a β_0 independent constant.

Then the ambiguous imaginary part due to the branch cut in the power correction is given by

$$\mathrm{Im}A_{\rm NP}^{\rm amb.}(a_s \pm i\epsilon) = \pm c_0 \sin(\nu\pi) e^{-\frac{n}{2a_s}} a_s^{-\nu}[1 + O(1/\beta_0)]\,. \tag{11}$$

For this to be $O(1/\beta_0)$, we have

$$c_0 \sin(\nu\pi) \sim O(1/\beta_0)\,, \tag{12}$$

which allows one to write ν as

$$\nu = \kappa + \frac{\chi}{\beta_0} + O(1/\beta_0^2)\,, \tag{13}$$

where κ is an integer and χ is a real constant, and

$$c_0 \sin(\nu\pi) = \frac{(-1)^\kappa c_0 \chi \pi}{\beta_0}[1 + O(1/\beta_0)]\,. \tag{14}$$

With Eq. (13), the expansion of the power correction in $1/\beta_0$ gives

$$A_{\rm NP}^{\rm amb.} = (-1)^\kappa c_0 e^{-\frac{n}{2a_s}} a_s^{-\kappa}[1 - \frac{\chi}{\beta_0}\ln(-a_s) + O(1/\beta_0^2)]\,, \tag{15}$$

which contains the logarithmic cut of precisely the type (4) that we were looking for. The corresponding renormalon singularity is a pole,

$$\tilde{A}(b) = \frac{c_0 \chi \kappa! \left(\frac{-2}{n}\right)^{1+\kappa}}{\beta_0} \frac{1}{(1 - 2b/n)^{1+\kappa}}[1 + O(1 - 2b/n)]\,. \tag{16}$$

This shows that the $1/\beta_0$ suppression of the renormalon ambiguity and the pole nature of the renormalon singularity share the same origin and are just two sides of the same coin.

Now taking the real and imaginary parts of the power correction we have, to $O(1/\beta_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\, A_{\mathrm{NP}}^{\mathrm{amb.}}(a_s \pm i\epsilon) &= (-1)^\kappa c_0 e^{-\frac{n}{2a_s}} a_s^{-\kappa}[1 - \frac{\chi}{\beta_0}\ln(a_s)]\,, \\ \mathrm{Im}\, A_{\mathrm{NP}}^{\mathrm{amb.}}(a_s \pm i\epsilon) &= \pm\frac{(-1)^\kappa c_0 \pi\chi}{\beta_0} e^{-\frac{n}{2a_s}} a_s^{-\kappa}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Note that the imaginary part is subleading to the real part, as we claimed, and the functional form for the real part to $O(1/\beta_0)$ is different from that of the imaginary part. This shows that the common practice of taking the renormalon ambiguity (imaginary part) as an estimate of the magnitude of the power correction [1] is not only incorrect functionally but also misses the leading contribution which, having no cut, is invisible to the perturbation theory. This missing of the leading power correction by perturbation theory is not unique to this example; It occurs in other models with a pole singularity, for instance, in $1/N$ expansion of the two-dimensional $O(N)$ nonlinear sigma model [6], in which the sigma self energy has a dynamically generated mass at $O[(1/N)^0]$, which, being free of cut singularity in coupling plane, does not cause any divergent large order behavior. In this model the perturbative weak coupling expansion starts at $O(1/N)$, and the renormalon ambiguity, which is necessarily of $O(1/N)$, cannot trace the leading order dynamical mass. Essentially the same thing happens with the instanton-antiinstanton caused nonperturbative effect in the double well model, where the cut-free nonperturbative term cannot be traced by perturbation theory [3].

So far, we assumed implicitly that c_0 is a non-zero constant. This assumption is natural since there is no reason that c_0 should vanish. However, if c_0 is vanishing and C is $O(1/\beta_0)$, then it is easy to see that ν in Eq. (9) must be a non-integer, which implies that the renormalon singularity should be a cut rather than a pole, and that the real part of the nonperturbative effect occur at the same order as the imaginary part. In large β_0 approximation there is no known renormalon singularity of this type, and we conclude that this possibility is not realized and c_0 be a nonvanishing constant.

Finally, we apply the discussion so far to an explicit example, the power correction by the

[1] For example, Ref. [4] takes $\frac{1}{\pi}$ of the imaginary part as the nonperturbative effect in the case of Adler function. See also [5].

dimension four gluon condensate in the Adler function $D[\alpha_s]$. In this case the anomalous dimension vanishes, and we have

$$\nu = 2\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2} = \frac{2}{\beta_0}\frac{19}{4\pi} + O(1/\beta_0^2)\,, \tag{18}$$

which is indeed in the form (13) with

$$\kappa = 0\,, \qquad \chi = \frac{19}{2\pi}\,. \tag{19}$$

The exact Borel transform in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme of the Adler function in large β_0 approximation is given as [4, 7]

$$\tilde{D}(b) = \frac{1}{\pi\beta_0}\frac{e^{\frac{10}{3}}}{(1-b/2)}[1 + O(1-b/2)]\,. \tag{20}$$

Comparing this with Eq. (16), with κ, χ given in Eq. (19), we find

$$c_0 = -\frac{4}{19}e^{\frac{10}{3}}\,, \tag{21}$$

and the real part of the power correction

$$\mathrm{Re}\, D_{\rm NP}^{\rm amb.}(\alpha_s) = c_0 e^{-\frac{2}{a_s}}[1 - \frac{19}{2\pi\beta_0}\ln(a_s)]\,, \tag{22}$$

which is nonvanishing in $\beta_0 \to \infty$. This example shows that the physically relevant real part is indeed $O(1)$ compared to the $O(1/\beta_0)$ imaginary part, and the cancellation of the ambiguities in the Borel resummed amplitude and nonperturbative effect allows one to recover part of the nonperturbative effect, even those not visible perturbatively, from perturbation theory.

To conclude, based on a general argument on Borel resummation of a same sign large order behavior, we have shown that in general the renormalon singularities in large β_0 approximation should be poles, and the power corrections be of $O(1)$ whereas the renormalon ambiguities are $O(1/\beta_0)$.

Acknowledgments

The author is thankful to the support from National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

[1] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1989).

[2] M. Beneke and V. M. Braun, Phys. Lett. **B348**, 513 (1995), hep-ph/9411229.

[3] T. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 034027 (2002), hep-ph/0104306.

[4] M. Beneke, Phys. Rept. **317**, 1 (1999), hep-ph/9807443.

[5] M. Kiyo and Y. Sumino,, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 071501 (2003), hep-ph/0211299.

[6] M. Beneke, V. M. Braun and N. Kivel, Phys. Lett. B **443**, 308 (1998), hep-ph/9809287.

[7] D. J. Broadhurst, Z. Phys. C **58**, 339 (1993).